

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 873

CS 502 007

AUTHOR Berryman, Cynthia L.; Wilcox, James R.
 TITLE Attitudes toward Male and Female Speech: Experiments on the Effects of Sex-Typical Language.
 PUB DATE Dec 77
 NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (63rd, Washington, D.C., December 1-4, 1977)
 EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Females; *Language Attitudes; Language Styles; *Males; *Sex Role; *Sex Stereotypes; Speech; *Speech Communication

ABSTRACT

This document describes two experiments that tested male and female attitudes toward sex-typical language. In the first experiment, 119 undergraduate females were asked to read and evaluate one of two written passages where the linguistic features were manipulated to create male and female sex-typed versions. Participants were tested on their attitude toward the following: the message, speaker of the message, sex-role stereotype of the speaker, and sex identity of the speaker. In addition, they were asked to complete the Fand Inventory of Feminine Values. The results reflect significant differences in the evaluation of source-anonymous male and female speakers in the areas of sex, command, self-orientation, and compliance. The second experiment, involving 59 females and 42 males, repeated the sex-typed readings of the first experiment. The results indicate that evaluation of female speakers differs significantly from that of male speakers with regard to command, accommodation, plausibility, and sex. Six data tables and a bibliography accompany the document. (MAI)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED151873

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ATTITUDES TOWARD MALE AND FEMALE SPEECH:

EXPERIMENTS ON THE EFFECTS OF

SEX-TYPICAL LANGUAGE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Cynthia L. Berryman

James R. Wilcox

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

by

Cynthia L. Berryman

and

James K. Wilcox

Bowling Green State University

CS582 007

Attitudes Toward Male and Female Speech:
Experiments on the Effects of
Sex-Typical Language

Recent communication literature has exhibited interest in sex as a meaningful variable for research and as a source of concern in human relationships. We live in an era increasingly characterized by sexual equality, indeed an era in which women and men are more interested in liberation from traditional stereotyped images and roles. Yet research findings to date indicate that men and women seem to engage in differential communication behaviors and furthermore are perceived as communicating differentially (Baird, 1976; Patton & Patton, 1976; Markel, Long, and Saine, 1976).

No doubt the socialization process has contributed heavily to stereotypical sex images. Research shows that children are socialized into assuming behavior patterns consistent with stereotyped sex role images (Bardwick & Douvan, 1971). Baird (1976) has summarized these images as follows:

Males commonly are thought to be independent, aggressive, task oriented, outwardly oriented, assertive, self-disciplined, stoic, objective, innovative, analytic-minded and unsentimental; Females are thought to be dependent, passive, fragile, non-aggressive,

non-competitive, inner-oriented, interpersonally oriented, empathetic, sensitive, subjective, intuitive, and supportive. (p. 180)

Baird's (1976) organized compilation of research on sex differences in group communication is supportive of the sex role theory of behavior. He concludes by observing:

. . . (males) are more task oriented in their interactions, more active and aggressive verbally, more interested and capable in problem solving, more willing to take risks, more resistant to social influences, more competitive when bargaining, and more likely to assume leadership in task-oriented situations. Females . . . are more willing to self-disclose, more expressive of emotions and perceptive of others' emotional states, more sensitive to nonverbal cues, less interested and able in problem-solving, relatively unwilling to assume risks, more yielding to social pressure, more cooperative in bargaining and less likely to assume leadership
(p. 192)

Baird's review concerned sex differences in group communication. There also exists a literature which has explored sex distinctions in linguistic behavior and has supported the existence of certain linguistic features which appear to distinguish male from female speech. Not only do these findings suggest the sexes vary in topics of

discourse, but also that females are more likely than males to use "correct" linguistic forms, use questions as opposed to assertions, use intensifying adverbs, use words implying feeling and emotion, and use exclamations and expletives which are mild and nonobscene. Also, common stereotypes could propose that women are more likely than men to be "talkative," i.e., to generate a greater volume of discourse.

An early attempt to propose that sex distinctions may exist in English saw women, more than men, as the users of euphemisms, bizarre words, adverbs of intensity, less extensive and abstract vocabularies, and incomplete assertions (Jespersen, 1922).

Research has shown that males and females are likely to discourse about different topics (Landis & Burr, 1924; Kinsey, 1953; Komarovsky, 1967; Kramer, 1974). Generally, these findings indicate that women may be more likely to talk of self-oriented topics and men more likely to talk of other-oriented topics.

Research indicates that women are more likely than men to use linguistic forms characterized by correctness (Fisher, 1958; Flexner, 1960; Shuy, 1969; Farb, 1973).

There may be certain syntactic features in women's speech which create an appearance of politeness and uncertainty. The tag-question is one construction which women use conversationally far more than men (Lakoff, 1974).

A tag-question, midway between an outright statement and a yes-no question, is less assertive than the former and may indicate less certainty. Sometimes a woman will use a question instead of a flat statement in a discussion to avoid the appearance of dogmatism (Bernard, 1964). One study showed that women asked nearly three times as many questions as men did (Fishman, 1975).

Female speech also contains more references to self (Glesner, Gottschalk, & John, 1959) and includes more words implying feeling and emotion (Strodtbeck & Mann, 1956; Glesner, Gottschalk, & John, 1959; Kramer, 1975).

Female speakers tend to use more intensifying adverbs than male-speakers (Jespersen, 1922; Key, 1972; Farb, 1973; Berryman, 1975).

Some researchers note a sex difference in type and function of exclamations and expletives. Males may be more likely than females to use stronger expletives, harsh language, and obscenities. Female expletives are likely to be weaker and less obscene (Lakoff, 1973; Kramer, 1974; Berryman, 1975).

The question of relative talkativeness of the sexes is as yet unsettled. Some studies have shown no clear difference in amount of speech (Hirschman, 1973; 1974). That men generate a greater volume of speech than women has been demonstrated in some studies which explored mixed sex interaction (Argyle, Lalljee, & Cook, 1968; Bernard, 1968).

Subjects in another study perceived women as more talkative than men (Kramer, 1975). These latter findings, though they do not resolve the issue, are at least compatible with the cultural stereotype of women as more talkative.

While these apparent sex differences may await the confirmation of considerably more empirical validation, the evidence to date suggests that males and females encode messages somewhat differentially or at least are thought to engage in different linguistic behavior. Possibly such alleged differences are less than consequential and are, in fact, more a function of "folk-myth". In any case, further research may assist in clarifying the nature of such differences--are they "real" or perceptual?

With respect to a majority of these findings concerning sex-typical language, as far as we can ascertain, the sex of communicators is known, both to the individuals with whom they are interacting and/or to the individuals observing and rendering perceptions of or evaluatively assessing their communication behaviors. We therefore suggest that, if the socialization process is as pervasive and influential as it is thought to be, behaviors of interacting participants and observations and assessments of those behaviors may be so influenced by expectation (derived from cultural stereotype) that it is impossible to determine where causal relations lie.

The present research then may be regarded as a first step toward clarifying relationships between objective communication behavior differentiations and culturally based expectations of behavior of male and female communicators. If subjects are exposed to source-anonymous messages containing sex-based linguistic features, will they differ in terms of their attributions of characteristics of the speakers as a result of these varied linguistic features? To examine attitudes toward source-anonymous sex-typical messages, the following hypotheses were proposed:

There will be a significant relationship between sex-type of a message as an exclusive function of sex based linguistic distinctions and:

- (1) Subject's post-communication attitudes toward the message;
- (2) Subject's post-communication attitudes toward the speaker;
- (3) Subject's assessments of the speaker's sex role characteristics.

It was further hypothesized that subjects' own sex-role orientation would influence their attitude toward the message, attitude toward the speaker, and attribution of sex-role characteristics to the speaker.

EXPERIMENT 1

MethodDesign

The experimental design resolved to a 2 by 2 factorial, incorporating two levels of sex-role orientation (self-orientation and other-orientation) and two levels of message (female sex-typed language and male sex-typed language). Three instruments: attitude toward the message, attitude toward the speaker, and sex-role stereotype of the speaker served as dependent measures.

Experimental Manipulations and Measurement

Sex-Role Orientation. Sex-role orientation was operationalized as scores on the Fand Inventory of Feminine Values (Fand, 1955). The inventory, which consists of 34 items, each of which expresses a view related to women's activities and satisfactions, distinguishes between other-oriented females and self-oriented females. Previous research has indicated reliability coefficients of the instrument ranging from .81 to .89 (Fand, 1955; Steinmann, 1957; Porter, 1967; McKenzie, 1971; and Carr, 1974). A modified 26-item version of the inventory developed by factor analytic procedures (Carr, 1974) was used in this study.

Level of Message. Two written messages concerning grading policies in education were composed. Subjects were

told that the message was a transcript of one participant's oral contributions in a group discussion. The content of the messages was identical but linguistic features were manipulated to create male and female sex-typed versions. The female message contained eight intensifiers, nine references to the self, six questions, two tag-questions, four phrases implying feeling or emotion, and one unfinished sentence and was 384 words in length. The male message contained one reference to the self, no intensifiers, no questions, no tag-questions, no phrases implying feeling or emotion, no unfinished sentences, two obscenities, four instances of slang, and five instances of incorrect grammar and was 338 words in length. Fifty-three subjects from the Small Group Communication course at Bowling Green served in the pilot study to test the validity of these messages. Subjects read one of the sex-anonymous messages, recorded a judgment as to the speaker's sex and gave reasons for their choices. Sixty-six per cent of the respondents correctly judged the male message, and seventy-eight of the respondents correctly judged the female message. Since most of the stated reasons for choice were linguistically oriented, i.e., made reference to those kinds of encoding features listed in the earlier review, these messages were used in the reported experiments.

Attitude Toward the Message. A seven-point, ten-item semantic differential scale previously developed by

Tucker (1974) served to measure attitude toward the message.

Attitude Toward the Speaker. Subjects' attitude toward the speaker was measured by a 34 bipolar adjective scale developed by Tucker (1974) and also used and validated by Carr (1974).

Sex-Role Stereotype of the Speaker. Sex-role stereotype of the speaker was measured by an instrument developed by Broverman, et. al (1970). Broverman, et. al report that correlation of odd with even items is .81 for male respondents and .83 for female respondents. A modified version of the inventory developed by factor analytic procedures (Sloman, 1974) was used in this study.

Subjects

One hundred and nineteen undergraduate females enrolled in the introductory speech course at Bowling Green State University volunteered to participate in this study. Female subjects were used because the Fand Inventory is applicable only to females. All subjects received course credit for their participation. Data on four subjects were omitted because of partially completed instruments. The data from nine completed instruments were randomly discarded to equalize cell frequencies on the type-of-message factor. Data from a total of 108 subjects were included in the statistical analyses.

Procedure

Each subject reported to one of two experimental rooms. When all subjects had arrived, the experimenters distributed booklets, which alternately contained the male or female message. Subjects read the message, completed the measures of attitude toward the message, attitude toward the speaker of the message, sex-role stereotype of the speaker, attempted to identify the sex of the speaker of the message, and completed the Fand Inventory of Feminine Values.

Data Analysis

Scoring of the Fand Inventory of Feminine Values resulted in inadequate discrimination of subjects' scores into the self-oriented and other-oriented categories. The instrument, while reportedly reliable by several researchers, was created in 1955 and therefore assumed to be out of date. Due to the contemporary emphasis on sex-role equality, subjects may have perceived the sex-oriented statements as socially desirable responses. To achieve adequate cell size to make statistical analysis possible, this independent variable was eliminated in the data analysis. The data were treated as a one factor, two levels design, with each subject placed on a level of the factor based on which sex-typed message was read.

Factor analysis (principal factors with communality estimates by the method of Squared Multiple Correlations)

with orthogonal rotation was used to investigate the dimensionality of the dependent measuring instruments. Orthogonal rotation was used because of its simplicity, mathematical elegance, conceptual clarity, and amenability to subsequent manipulations and analyses (Rummel, 1970). The criteria for interpretation of results included the following: (1) an eigenvalue of 1.0 was set for termination of factor extraction; (2) for an item to be considered loaded on a factor, it was required to have a primary loading of at least .50 on that factor and to have no secondary loading above one-half of the primary loading; and (3) in order for a factor to be considered meaningful, it must have at least two items loaded on it.

Results

The factor analysis resulted in extraction of thirteen factors. Factor scores for each subject on each of these thirteen factors were computed via the regression model. These thirteen factor scores per subject served as dependent measures which were subsequently inputted into a multivariate analysis of variance. The multivariate analysis of variance, using Roy's largest root criterion as a test statistic, indicated a significant difference in rating of the two sex-typed messages ($F = 5.59$; $df = 13/94$; $p < .0001$).

Insert Table 1 about here

The multivariate analysis of variance revealed four factors that maximally differentiated between ratings of the male and female sex-typed messages. Only these four factors, as opposed to the total thirteen factors extracted from the factor analysis, were therefore interpreted.

Insert Table 2 about here

Factor I was labeled a sex factor defined by the loadings of two scale items: very masculine/not at all masculine and very feminine/not at all feminine. Factor II was interpreted as a commanding dimension according to the loadings of seven scale items: very dominant/very submissive; very shy/very out-going; not at all self-confident/very self confident; not at all aggressive/very aggressive; very rarely takes extreme positions/very often takes extreme positions; retiring/forward; and almost never acts as a leader/almost always acts as a leader. Factor III was labeled a self-orientation dimension defined by the loadings of two scale items: very strong need for security/very little need for security; and always does things without being told/never does things without being told. Factor IV was interpreted as a compliance

dimension according to the loadings of four scale items: sinister/open; flexible/inflexible; practical/impractical; and democratic/autocratic.

The four factors did not contribute equally to the significant difference between groups. Examination of the results of univariate analysis of variance (included in the Finn 1972 Multivariate program package) revealed significant mean differences on these four factors: sex ($F = 21.1$; $p < .001$), command ($F = 10.60$; $p < .0016$), self-orientation ($F = 9.65$; $p < .0025$), and compliance ($F = 5.05$; $p < .0267$).

Comparison of subjects' mean ratings of the female sex-typed speaker with the mean ratings of the male sex-typed speaker showed directional differences on specific variables. The male speaker was seen as more masculine and less feminine while the female speaker was seen as more feminine and less masculine. The speaker of the male message was rated as more commanding; that is, more dominant, outgoing, self-confident, aggressive, extreme, forward, and more of a leader than the speaker of the female message. The male speaker was rated as less self-oriented than the female speaker. Subjects rated the male speaker as less often doing things without being told and as having more need for security than the female speaker. Results indicate that the male speaker was seen as less compliant; that is, more sinister, more inflexible, more

impractical, and more autocratic than the speaker of the female message.

Insert Table 3 about here

The validity of subjects' judgments concerning the sex of the speaker in this study averaged to 69 per cent, with the female message judged correctly by 54 per cent of the respondents and the male message judged correctly by 85 per cent of the respondents.

Discussion

Results of Experiment I indicate that evaluation of the speaker of female sex-typed language differs most significantly from evaluation of the speaker of male sex-typed language on the dimensions of sex, command, self-orientation, and compliance. The male speaker was seen as more masculine; the female speaker was seen as feminine. The female speaker was seen as more self-oriented yet more compliant; the male as less self-oriented yet less compliant.

That the speaker of the sex-anonymous female message was judged as feminine and the speaker of the sex-anonymous male message was judged as masculine substantiates literature theorizing the existence of sex-based language distinctions. Data show that certain syntactical, grammatical, and lexical components of communication are selectively attributed to the sexes.

On the command dimension, the female speaker was seen as more shy, less self confident, less aggressive, less extreme, more retiring, more submissive, and less likely to act as a leader. These results support existing literature concerning sex differences in human behavior and are also consistent with societal stereotypical views of sex differences. For example, Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) report that boys make more dominance attempts and are more physically and verbally aggressive than girls. The use of questions, especially tag-questions, may have elicited an impression of uncertainty, a lack of self confidence, non-assertiveness, shyness, submissiveness, and avoidance of extreme positions. The use of incomplete assertions may also have contributed to this evaluation. Conversely, the evaluation of the male sex-typical speaker as more forward, more confident, more aggressive, more outgoing, more dominant, more likely to take extreme positions, and more likely to act as a leader may be a consequence of the absence of questions and unfinished sentences and the inclusion of obscenities in the male message.

The self-orientation factor yields results somewhat incompatible with expectations. The female speaker was seen as more self-oriented in the sense of having less need for security and more often doing things without being told. The male speaker was seen as more dependent

and more other-oriented. Perhaps the use of obscenities, slang, and incorrect grammar by the male speaker created an impression of insecurity and dependency.

The rating of the female speaker as more compliant than the male speaker corroborates Maccoby and Jacklin's (1974) conclusion that girls tend to be more compliant to the demands and directions of adults. Use of questions and tag-questions by the female speaker and use of obscenities, slang, and incorrect grammar by the male speaker may have accounted for this difference.

EXPERIMENT II

Rationale

Certain features of Experiment I led to the desirability of conducting a second experiment, this primarily designed to focus on the question of significant multivariate relationships between sex-type of message and:

- (a). Subjects' post-communication attitudes toward the message
- (b). Subjects' post-communication attitudes toward the speaker
- (c). Subjects' ratings of the speaker's sex-role characteristics.

The first feature which led to further experimentation concerned the measure of sex-role orientation. The Fand Inventory of Feminine Values, administered to all subjects in Experiment I, yielded scores which did not adequately

discriminate between self and other-oriented categories. Consequently, sex-role orientation was eliminated as a potential independent variable in Experiment II. There seemed no reason to assume it would adequately discriminate in Experiment II with subjects from the same general population. The second feature was the exclusive use of female subjects in Experiment I, which made results generalizable only to females. At this stage, it seemed appropriate to draw a sample from a mixed-sex population.

Method

Design

A one factor, two levels design was employed by varying the sex-typed language of the message. Three instruments: attitude toward the message, attitude toward the speaker, and sex-role stereotype of the speaker served as dependent measures.

Experimental Manipulations and Measurement

The two messages concerning grading policies in education which were used in Experiment I served as the independent variable in this study. The dependent measures included the same three scales used in Experiment I.

Subjects

One-hundred and one undergraduate students (59 females and 42 males) from the introductory speech course at Bowling Green State University voluntarily participated

in this study. All received credit for their participation.

Procedure

Each subject reported to one of two experimental rooms. The same experimenters as in the first study distributed experimental booklets, which alternately contained the male or female message. Subjects read the message, completed the measures of attitude toward the message, attitude toward the speaker of the message, sex-role stereotype of the speaker, and attempted to identify the sex of the speaker of the message.

Data Analysis

Factor analysis (principal factors with communality estimates by the method of Squared Multiple Correlation) with orthogonal rotation to simple structure was performed on the dependent measuring instruments. The criteria for interpretation of factors included a 1.0 eigenvalue cut-off for factor extraction, a primary loading of at least .50 with no secondary loading in excess of one-half of the primary loading, and at least two items defining a factor.

Results

Thirteen factors were extracted and factor scores were computed for input into a multivariate analysis of variance. A significant multivariate F resulted from the multivariate analysis of variance ($F = 4.51$; $df = 13/87$; $p < .0001$).

Insert Table 4 about here

Four factors maximally contributed to the obtained significance.

Insert Table 5 about here

Factor I was labeled a commanding dimension in accordance with sex scale items, five of which defined this dimension in the previous study: not at all aggressive/very aggressive; very dominant/very submissive; gives up very easily/never gives up easily; very shy/very outgoing; almost always acts as a leader/almost never acts as a leader; and very self-confident/not at all self confident. Factor II was named an accomodation dimension defined by the loadings of six scale items: very grateful/very ungrateful; inflexible/flexible; selfish/unselfish; very understanding/not at all understanding; friendly/unfriendly; and tolerant/intolerant. The five scales loading highly on Factor III were interpreted as indicating a plausibility dimension. These items included: significant/inconsequential; valid/invalid; rational/irrational; relevant/irrelevant; and worthless/valuable. Factor IV was the sex factor defined by the items very masculine/not at all masculine and very feminine/not at all feminine.

Since subjects in this experiment included both males and females, these data were analyzed according to both sex of subject and sex of message source. The multivariate analysis of variance resulted in a nonsignificant interaction effect ($p < .64$), a nonsignificant main effect for sex of subject ($p < .08$), but a significant main effect for sex of message source ($p < .001$). Subject sex, then, did not significantly affect ratings of the sex-typical speakers, i.e., both male and female subjects similarly evaluated the sex-typical sources.

The univariate analysis of variance showed the following mean differences in the contribution of these factors to the significant difference between groups: command ($F = 13.06$; $p < .0005$); accommodation ($F = 8.05$; $p < .00560$); plausibility ($F = 4.69$; $p < .0327$); sex ($F = 3.38$; $p < .0688$).

Comparison of mean ratings on specific variables indicate the following directional differences. The male speaker was seen as more commanding--more aggressive, more dominant, less likely to give up easily, more outgoing, more likely to act as a leader, and more self confident than the speaker of the female message. The male speaker was seen as less accommodating than the female speaker. The male speaker was rated as ungrateful, inflexible, selfish, unfriendly, intolerant, and non-understanding. The message of the male speaker was rated as less plausible than the

message of the female speaker. The male message was evaluated as less significant, less valid, less rational, less relevant, and less valuable than the female message. Concerning the sex dimension, the male speaker was judged to be more masculine and less feminine while the female speaker was seen as more feminine and less masculine.

Insert Table 6 about here

In this study, the validity of the messages averaged 69 per cent, with 79 per cent of the respondents correctly judging the sex of the male speaker and 58 per cent of the respondents correctly judging the sex of the female speaker.

Discussion

Results of Experiment II indicate that evaluation of the female speaker differs most significantly from evaluation of the male speaker on the dimensions of command, accomodation, plausibility, and sex. The male speaker was seen as more commanding, the female speaker as less commanding. The female speaker was seen as more accomodating and as presenting a more plausible message. The male speaker was seen as less accomodating and as presenting a less plausible message. The speaker of the sex-anonymous female message was judged as more feminine, while the speaker of the sex-anonymous male message was judged as more masculine.

Experiment I yielded four factors which maximally discriminated perceptions of male and female sex-typed

language. Experiment II also yielded four maximally discriminating factors. Two of these, sex and command, were the same factors as yielded in Experiment I. Two were different: accomodation and plausibility. Repetition of nearly identical results with Experiment I seems pointless. The sex and command factors yielded virtually identical findings with one exception. The command factor was defined by five of the six scale items from the previous study, excluding the items: retiring/forward and rarely takes extreme positions/often takes extreme positions. Additionally, it was defined as it had not been in Experiment I by the item: gives up very easily/never gives up easily.

Experiment II yielded the factors of accomodation and plausibility, as contrasted with self-orientation and compliance in Experiment I. The male speaker was seen as less accomodating than the female speaker. The male speaker was seen as more ungrateful, more inflexible, more selfish, less friendly, less tolerant, and less understanding than the female speaker. That the female was rated oppositely may have been a consequence of the use of questions as contrasted with assertions. Also, the feeling and emotion phrases may have contributed to a perception of friendliness. The obscenities, slang, and incorrect grammar in the male message may have contributed to the

differential evaluation as well, especially with regard to friendliness, flexibility, gratefulness, and understanding.

The female message was rated as more plausible, that is, more significant, valid, rational, relevant, and valuable. Use of correct grammar in particular probably contributed most to this perception. Possibly the slightly greater length of the female message also augmented this perception.

Conclusions

These experiments were intended as tests of the hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between sex-type of message (as an exclusive function of sex-based linguistic distinctions) and subject attitudes toward message, toward the anonymous message source, and subject assessments of source sex-role characteristics. Clearly it is not possible, as a consequence of the factor analytic procedure, which of course is intended to locate common elements which underlie a set of measures, to make clear distinctions between these three sub-categories. In fact, the pooling of the three dependent measures obscures such distinctions, yet simultaneously makes possible the clear establishment of an overall relationship between sex type and subject evaluation. Subjects did perceive differences between treatments as indicated by differential evaluations of their perception of

sex-based messages and their anonymous sources. We believe these differences must be attributed primarily to the linguistic distinctions contained in the messages. It is of course impossible to rule out the possibility that subjects actively attempted to identify the sex of the message source. They were asked to identify their perception of source gender as the final item in the post-communication questionnaire. They may at any time prior to completion of that item have made a decision as to source gender; there is no way of controlling for that possibility. Even if subjects did attempt to make an identification decision, the only constant basis for that decision would have been the linguistic features of the message they were exposed to.

Therefore, this study shows that speakers may be differentially evaluated as a result of linguistic distinctions in their messages. Such a finding has implications for further research concerning sex effects in communication. It seems that characteristics attributed to male and female communicators are not a consequence solely of stereotypical images and expectations which may immediately accrue from sex identification. Rather, they may be a consequence of the communication behaviors, in this case, linguistic characteristics, of the speaker. Further research needs to compare the effects of linguistic

features with the effects of stereotypical images which may result from gender identification and to differentiate these effects as they contribute to a perception of communicator image.

References

- Argyle, M., Lalljee, M., & Cook, M. The effect of visibility on interaction in a dyad. Human Relations, 1968, 21, 3-17.
- Baird, J. E., Jr. Sex differences in group communication: A review of relevant research. The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1976, 62, 179-192.
- Bardwick, J. & Douvan, E. Ambivalence: the socialization of women, in J. E. Baird. Sex differences in group communication: A review of relevant research. The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1976, 62, 179-192.
- Bernard, J. Academic Women. University Park: The Penn State University Press, 1964.
- Berryman, C. L. The language of women as a reflection of the image of women in a mass-circulation magazine: An analysis of Ladies Home Journal fiction, 1900-1920. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Summer Conference, July 1975.
- Broverman, I. K., Broverman, D. H., Clarkson, F. E., Rosenkrantz, P., & Vogel, S. R. Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1970, 34, 1-7.
- Carr, K. S. Sex role orientation as it relates to persuasibility of females: An experimental study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University, 1974.
- Fand, A. B. Sex role and self-concept: A study of the feminine sex role as perceived by eighty-five college women for themselves, their ideal woman, the average woman, and men's ideal woman. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, 1955.

- Farb, P. Word Play: What Happens When People Talk. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1973.
- Finn, J. Multivariate. Chicago: National Education Resources, Inc., 1972.
- Fischer, J. L. Social influences on the choice of a linguistic variant. Word, 1958, 14, 47-56.
- Fishman, P. Interaction: The work women do. Paper presented at the Meeting of the American Sociological Association, August 1975.
- Flexner, S. Preface to Dictionary of American Slang. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1960.
- Gleser, G. C., Gottschalk, L. A., & John, W. The relationship of sex and intelligence to choice of words: A normative study of verbal behavior. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1959, 15, 182-191.
- Hirschman, L. Female-male differences in conversational interaction. Paper presented at the Meeting of Linguistic Society of America, December 1973.
- Hirschman, L. Analysis of supportive and assertive behavior in conversations. Paper presented at the Meeting of Linguistic Society of America, July 1974.
- Jespersen, O. Language. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1922.
- Key, M. R. Linguistic behavior of male and female. Linguistics, 1972, 88, 15-31.
- Kinsey, A. C. & Associates. Sexual Behavior in the Human Female. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1953.
- Komarovsky, M. Blue-Collar Marriage. New York: Vintage, 1967.

- Kramer, C. Female and male perception of female and male speech. Paper presented at the Meeting of the American Sociological Association, August 1975.
- Kramer, C. Folklinguistics. Psychology Today, 1974, 8, 82-85.
- Lakoff, R. Language and woman's place. Language in Society, 1973, 2, 45-79.
- Lakoff, R. You are what you say. Ms., 1974, 3, 63-67.
- Landis, M. H. & Burtt, H. E. A study of conversations. Journal of Comparative Psychology, 1924, 4, 81-89.
- Maccoby, E. & Jacklin, C. The Psychology of Sex Differences. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974.
- Markel, N. N., Long, J. F. & Saine, T. J. Sex effects in conversation: Another look at male dominance. Human Communication Research, 1976, 2, 356-364.
- McKenzie, S. P. A comparative study of feminine role perceptions, selected personality characteristics and traditional attitudes of professional women and housewives. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1971.
- Patton, B. R. & Patton, B. R. Living Together: Female/Male Communication. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1976.
- Porter, J. Sex-role concepts, their relationship to psychological well-being and to future plans of

female college seniors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Rochester, 1967.

Rummel, R. J. Applied Factor Analysis. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1970.

huy, R. W. Sex as a factor in sociolinguistic research. Unpublished manuscript, 1969 (Available from the Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.).

Sloman, C. L. Sex variables and source credibility: A multivariate investigation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University, 1974.

Steinman, A. G. The concept of the feminine role in the American family: A study of the feminine role of fifty-one middle-class American families. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1957.

Strodtbeck, F. L. & Mann, R. D. Sex role differentiation in jury deliberations. Sociometry, 1956, 19, 3-11.

Swacker, M. The sex of the speaker as a sociolinguistic variable. In B. Thorne & N. Henley (eds.), Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House, 1975.

Tucker, R. K. N-1 persuasive messages: Experiments on effect of message length. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, December 1974.

Table 1
Multivariate and Univariate Analysis of Variance for
Effect of Sex-Typed Message: Experiment I

Multivariate Analysis of Variance

<u>D.F.</u>	<u>F-Ratio</u>	<u>p less than</u>
13 and 94	5.59	.0001

Univariate Analysis of Variance

<u>Factor</u>	<u>F-Ratio</u>	<u>p less than</u>
1. Sex	21.21	.0001
2. Command	10.60	.0016
3. Self-orientation	9.65	.0025
4. Compliance	5.05	.0267

Table 2

Dependent Measure Factor Loadings: Experiment I

<u>Item</u>	<u>Self-</u>			
	<u>Sex</u>	<u>Command</u>	<u>Orientation</u>	<u>Compliance</u>
1. very masculine/not at all masculine	.78	.11	-.12	-.07
2. very feminine/not at all feminine	.75	.11	-.01	-.06
3. very dominant/very submissive	.03	.79	.05	.03
4. very shy/very outgoing	.06	.71	-.19	.19
5. not at all self confident/ very self confident	.18	.69	-.23	.15
6. not at all aggressive/ very aggressive	.09	.69	.15	-.07
7. rarely/often takes extreme positions	-.00	.67	-.24	-.16
8. retiring/forward	-.04	.62	-.13	.12
9. always/never acts as a leader	.01	.57	-.20	.11
10. very little/very strong need for security	.20	.11	-.69	-.03
11. always/never does things without being told	.02	.20	-.52	.06

Table 2: Continued

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sex</u>	<u>Command</u>	<u>Self-Orientation</u>	<u>Compliance</u>
12. sinister/open	-.04	.14	.02	-.68
13. flexible/inflexible	-.03	.22	-.19	-.65
14. very practical/very impractical	.08	.04	.03	.62
15. democratic/autocratic	.00	-.17	.05	-.61

Table 3

Cell Means for Effect of Sex-Typed Message:

Experiment I

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Female Messages</u>	<u>Male Messages</u>
I. Sex		
1. Masculinity	3.74	4.57
2. Femininity*	3.96	4.91
II. Command		
1. Dominant	4.63	5.19
2. Outgoing	4.78	5.28
3. Self confident	4.48	4.89
4. Aggressive	4.39	5.15
5. Often takes extreme position	4.26	5.07
6. Forward	4.76	4.96
7. Always acts as a leader	4.91	5.04
III. Self-Orientation		
1. Little need for security	3.70	3.28
2. Always does things without being told	4.30	4.07

*On all items except this one, the higher mean indicates a greater degree of possession of the trait.

Table 3: Continued

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Female Message</u>	<u>Male Message</u>
IV. Compliance		
1. Sinister	2.81	3.24
2. Inflexible	3.33	3.81
3. Impractical	4.72	4.48
4. Autocratic	3.59	3.61

Table 4

Multivariate and Univariate Analysis of Variance for

Effect of Sex-Typed Message: Experiment II

Multivariate Analysis of Variance

<u>D.F.</u>	<u>F-Ratio</u>	<u>p less than</u>
13 and 87	4.51	.0001

Univariate Analysis of Variance

<u>Factor</u>	<u>F-Ratio</u>	<u>p less than</u>
1. Command	13.06	.0005
2. Accomodation	8.05	.0056
3. Plausibility	4.70	.0327
4. Sex	3.39	.0688

Table 5

Dependent Measure Factor Loadings: Experiment II

<u>Item</u>	<u>Command</u>	<u>Accommodation</u>	<u>Plausibility</u>	<u>Sex</u>
1. always/never acts as a leader	.78	-.08	.09	.09
2. not at all aggressive/ very aggressive	.73	.16	.14	.02
3. very dominant/very submissive	.73	.31	.18	.06
4. very shy/very outgoing	.71	.18	.08	-.00
5. never/always gives up easily	.70	.03	.28	.12
6. not at all self confident/ very self confident	.68	-.02	.23	.17
7. friendly/unfriendly	.11	.72	-.31	.15
8. flexible/inflexible	.21	.71	-.10	.12
9. very grateful/very ungrateful	.05	.71	.10	-.07
10. selfish/unselfish	.11	.70	-.17	.10
11. very/not at all understanding	-.12	.63	-.26	-.10
12. tolerant/intolerant	-.00	.57	-.19	-.12
13. rational/irrational	-.05	.17	-.83	.10
14. significant/ inconsequential	-.23	.04	-.79	-.03

Table 5: Continued

	<u>Item</u>	<u>Command</u>	<u>Accommodation</u>	<u>Plausibility</u>	<u>Sex</u>
15.	relevant/irrelevant	.00	.01	-.73	-.03
16.	valid/invalid	-.32	.21	-.72	.12
17.	valuable/worthless	-.22	.29	-.64	-.10
18.	very masculine/not at				
	all masculine	.14	.21	.01	.64
19.	very feminine/not at				
	all feminine	.09	.06	.03	.61

Table 6

Cell Means for Effect of Sex-Typed Message:

Experiment II

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Female Message</u>	<u>Male Message</u>
I. Command		
1. Aggressive	4.37	5.24
2. Dominant	4.29	5.06
3. Never gives up		
easily	4.56	5.00
4. Outgoing	4.98	5.63
5. Almost always acts		
as a leader	4.75	5.29
6. Very self confident	4.63	5.43
II. Accomodation		
1. Ungrateful	3.92	4.45
2. Inflexible	3.32	4.12
3. Selfish	3.29	4.12
4. Not understanding	3.10	3.41
5. Unfriendly	2.71	4.02
6. Intolerant	3.71	4.45
III. Plausibility		
1. Inconsequential	3.02	3.16
2. Invalid	3.04	3.45
3. Irrational	3.56	4.12
4. Irrelevant	2.77	2.92

Table 6: Continued

	<u>Factor</u>	<u>Female Message</u>	<u>Male Message</u>
	5. Worthless	3.35	2.96
IV. Sex			
	1. Masculinity	3.70	4.41
	2. Femininity*	3.63	4.31

*On all items except this one, the higher mean indicates a greater degree of possession of the trait.